

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XIII, Issue No. 5

November 2007

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

The Supreme Court and the Second Amendment

The Supreme Court has repeatedly referred to the Second Amendment as securing an individual right, not merely a collective right of states to arm the members of their militias. As early as 1857, in the now-disgraced *Dred Scott* case upholding the Fugitive Slave Act, the Court referred to the privileges and immunities of citizenship guaranteed by the Constitution to white persons but presumably not to African-Americans. Those privileges and immunities included "the full liberty of speech in public and in private upon all subjects upon which its own citizens might speak; to hold public meetings upon political affairs, and to keep and carry arms wherever they went." (*Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. 393, 417 (1857)).

It is not surprising that the earliest forms of "gun control" in our nation were Jim Crow laws.

Throughout the 20th Century, the Supreme Court has spoken favorably of the personal rights guaranteed and secured by the first eight amendments of the Constitution; such as the freedom of speech and of the press; the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for a redress of grievances, a right appertaining to each and all the people; the right to keep and to bear arms. (*Duncan v. Louisiana*, 391 U.S. 145, 166-67 (1968) (Black, J., concurring)).

Liberty encompasses "more than those rights already guaranteed to the individual against federal interference by the express provisions of the first eight Amendments." (*Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833, 847 (1992)).

Thus, the full scope of the liberty guaranteed by the Due Process Clause cannot be found in or limited by the precise terms of the specific guarantees elsewhere provided in the Constitution. This "liberty" is not a series of isolated points pricked out in terms of the taking of property; the freedom of speech, press, and religion; the right to keep and bear arms; the freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures; and so on. (*Casey*, 505 U.S. at 848 (quoting *Poe v. Ullman*, 367 U.S. 497, 543 (1961) (Harlan, J., dissenting); *Moore v. City of East Cleveland*, 431 U.S. 494 (1977)).

In *Johnson v. Eisentrager*, (339 U.S. 763, 784 (1950)), the Supreme Court held that enemy combatants were not entitled to Fifth Amendment Due Process rights, because if that were the case, they would also be entitled to "freedoms of speech, press, and assembly as in the First Amendment, right to bear arms as in the Second, security against 'unreasonable' searches and seizures as in the Fourth, as well as rights to jury trial as in the Fifth and Sixth Amendments."

And, as recently as 1990, the Supreme Court explained that "the people" protected by the Second Amendment are the same "people" i.e. individual human beings "protected by other portions of the Bill of Rights: [T]he people protected by the Fourth Amendment, and by the First and Second Amendments, and to whom rights and powers are reserved in the Ninth and Tenth Amendments, refers to a class of persons who are part of a national community or who have otherwise developed sufficient connection with this country to be considered part of that community

(*U.S. v. Verdugo-Urquidez*, 494 U.S. 259, 265 (1990)).

The Supreme Court's only direct ruling on a Second Amendment question came in *U.S. v. Miller*, 307, 174 (1939). Miller was charged with transporting a sawed-off shotgun and not paying the required tax. He successfully argued in the trial court that his actions were protected by the Second Amendment. When the Supreme Court agreed to hear the government's appeal, however, Miller could not afford counsel to argue his case or prepare written briefs on his behalf. Thus, the government argued the case unopposed. Even so, the Supreme Court ignored the government's primary argument, that the Second Amendment confers only a "collective right." Rather, the Court held that Miller could have the sawed-off shotgun if he were to show that such a weapon would be useful to him if called upon for militia duty. The case was sent back to the trial court for the taking of further evidence, but Miller was murdered before the case could be resolved.

Some courts have mistakenly cited the *Miller* case as endorsing a "collective rights" point of view, often without carefully analyzing the case. But *Miller* does not support the collective rights theory. Here is the crucial passage from the *Miller* opinion: "the absence of any evidence tending to show that possession or use of a [sawed-off] shotgun has some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated militia, we cannot say that the Second Amendment guarantees the right to keep and bear such an instrument." *Miller*, 307 U.S. at 178. Thus, *Miller* relates to the type of weapon. The Supreme Court did not

find that rights secured by the Second Amendment are "collective". Indeed, *Miller* explained that under the militia system, individuals called for duty were "expected to appear bearing arms supplied by themselves." (*Miller*, 307 U.S. at 179).

Miller is plainly consistent only with an individual rights model of the Second Amendment. The gun prohibition lobby's claims to the contrary, no matter how often or how fervently repeated, are untrue. We invite people to read *Miller* and reach their own conclusion.

-- Response to District of Columbia's Cert Petition; Filed by Clark Neily Partner Gura & Possessky, P.L.L.C DCGunCase.com, October 4, 2007

"Nightmare with No End in Sight"

ARLINGTON, Va. (AP) - The U.S. mission in Iraq is a "nightmare with no end in sight," said a former chief of U.S.-led forces Friday.

Retired Lt. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez, who commanded coalition troops for a year beginning June 2003, called current strategies—including the deployment of 30,000 additional forces earlier this year—a "desperate attempt" to make up for years of misguided policies in Iraq.

Sanchez avoided singling out at any specific official. But he did criticize the State Department, the National Security Council, Congress and the senior military leadership during what appeared to be a broad indictment of White House policies and a lack of leadership to oppose them.

Sanchez retired from the Army last year. He called his career a casualty of the Abu Ghraib prison scandal.

He was never charged with anything but he was not promoted in the aftermath of the prisoner abuse reports. He was criticized by some for not doing more to avoid mistreatment of Iraqi prisoners.

When asked when he saw that the mission was going awry, he responded: "About the 15th of June 2003"—the day he took command.

Sanchez said a full-scale withdrawal also was not an option.

"The American military finds itself in an intractable situation ... America has no choice but to continue our efforts in Iraq," said Sanchez, who works as a consultant training U.S. generals.

-- AP Oct. 13, 2007

Ed.: Retired three star general

Sanchez deserves credit for speaking out, something no other general has had the courage to do. Still he held fire till his pension was secure -- some four years after he realized the country faced a "nightmare with no end in sight."

Sanchez put his finger on the problem: a lack of leadership to oppose the Iraq policies. The AP reporter refers to "White House policies" but the problem lies with Congress too, in continuing to fund an undeclared war.

But what about Sanchez' leadership role? Why didn't he take the moral and constitutional high road by resigning his commission? Can you imagine our greatest general, George Washington, not having done so? Why isn't Washington the general all other U.S. soldiers seek to emulate?

Unfortunately Sanchez may be prolonging the nightmare by training other career generals of equal or lesser moral courage who no doubt would perpetuate it.

Six Figure Bonuses for U.S. Commandos

WASHINGTON (AP) - The Pentagon has paid more than \$100 million in bonuses to veteran Green Berets and Navy SEALs.

The retention effort, started nearly three years ago and overseen by U.S. Special Operations Command in Tampa, Fla., has helped preserve a small but elite group of enlisted troops with vast experience fighting the unconventional wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Overall, more than 1,200 of the military's most specialized personnel near or already eligible for retirement have opted for payments of up to \$150,000 in return for staying in uniform several more years.

While special operations forces are by no means the only candidates for security jobs in Iraq that can pay hundreds of dollars a day, they are the most attractive because of the unique training they receive.

In addition to being proficient with weapons, many of these troops have advanced education, the ability to speak the languages of the Middle East and other regions, and the cultural awareness that comes with living among the local populations.

In addition to retention bonuses, special operations personnel ranging from corporals to sergeants major also qualify for a special duty pay of \$375 a month above their normal salary.

The SOCOM bonus program was approved in late 2004 and targeted noncommissioned Army, Navy and Air Force commandos with 19 years or more of service. After 20 years, military personnel are eligible to retire at half pay and have lifetime access to military medical care and other benefits.

At the 19-year mark, an Army sergeant first class earns about \$63,400 annually, a figure that doesn't include what the Congressional Budget Office calls "noncash" benefits available to military members such as subsidized child care, lower grocery costs at base stores and free access to recreational facilities.

The "critical skills retention" bonuses work on a sliding scale. Those agreeing to stay an extra six years receive \$150,000; five years is worth \$75,000; four years, \$50,000; three years, \$30,000; two years, \$18,000; and one extra year, \$8,000.

Since January 2005, 2,326 have been eligible and more than half took bonuses.

Within the Army Special Forces, the largest U.S. commando branch better known as the Green Berets, more than 900 have traded time for money. More than a third of these troops agreed to six-year extensions.

Overall, at a cost of \$75 million, the Pentagon bought an average of 3.3 additional years from Green Berets with nearly two decades of experience in combat engineering, communications, intelligence and field medicine.

Just over 300 Navy SEALs—Sea, Air and Land commandos—have signed up for longer tours at a cost of \$27.6 million. More than half agreed to six additional years.

The Air Force pool of combat controllers and pararescuemen with at least 19 years of service is the smallest; 32 of these troops opted for bonuses costing \$3 million. Half took the six-year package.

-- AP, Oct. 11, 2007

Ed.: Send in your nickels, guys. We might have to start paying bonuses too.

"The American Dream"

By Chuck Baldwin

We hear much today about the American dream. By "the American dream," most people mean buying a big house, driving an expensive automobile, and making a lot of money. However, this was not the dream envisioned by the Founding Fathers. Remember that, for the most part, America's founders

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. — Mark Twain

gave up their material wealth and substance for something they considered of far greater worth.

In the minds of the founders, liberty--with all of its intrinsic risks--was more desirable than material prosperity.

So how dare Americans today refer to material gain as "the American dream." It is not! It is the freedom to honestly pursue one's goals that should be celebrated. Material gain is only a fruit of freedom, not its root.

Much of America's gain today is predicated upon dishonorable and even dishonest practices. Rather than cast off an unconstitutional and tyrannical tax system we choose to cast away the noble virtue of industry and hard work (because government will wind up with most of it, anyway) in favor of receiving revenue from the labor and effort of others. It is called socialism, and most Americans today (including Christians) appear to fully embrace it.

We expect government to fund our retirement, to reimburse our losses, and to even pay for our health care. What we cannot get from Uncle Sam, we expect from Lady Luck. Americans today want the fruit of freedom but seem unwilling to pay its purchase price.

Since World War II, we Americans have seemed willing to squander the sacrifice and repudiate the principles of our ancestors. With the way things are going, can you imagine what this nation will look like in another 50 years?

None of the Above

A little history lesson. Make your best guess on who said the following quotes. Hint: those who don't learn from the past are condemned to repeat it!

1. "We're going to take things away from you on behalf of the common good." (Karl Marx, Adolph Hitler, Joseph Stalin, None of the Above)

2. "It's time for a new beginning, for an end to government of the few, by the few, and for the few...and to replace it with shared responsibility for shared prosperity." (Vladimir Lenin, Benito Mussolini, Idi Amin, None of the Above)

3. "(We)...can't just let business as usual go on, and that means something has to be taken away from some people." (Nikita Krushchev, Joseph Goebbels, Vladimir Putin, None of the Above)

4. "We have to build a political consensus and that requires people to give up a little bit of their own...in order to create this common ground." (Mao

Tse-tung, Hugo Chavez, Kim Il Jong, None of the Above)

5. "I certainly think the free-market has failed." (Karl Marx, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Theodore Roosevelt, None of the Above)

6. "I think it's time to send a clear message to what has become the most profitable sector in (the) entire economy that they are being watched." (Pol Pot, Saddam Hussein, Robert Mugabe, None of the Above)

Answers: None of the Above.
All were made by Hillary Rodham Clinton. 1. 6/29/04. 2. 5/29/2007. 3. 6/4/2007. 4. 6/4/2007. 5. 6/4/2007. 6. 9/2/2005.

-- from the Internet

Right-to-Carry Permits & the Trojan Horse

Earlier this year, Virginia's *Roanoke Times* newspaper came under near-universal condemnation after its editors made the irresponsible and dangerous choice to post a searchable database of Virginia's Right-to-Carry permit holders on its website. In doing so, the paper provided anyone with access to the internet (including criminals) the name, home address, and permit issuance and expiration date of more than 135,000 Virginia permit holders.

Thankfully, after hearing from outraged, law-abiding gun owners and non-gun owners alike, the paper prudently decided to remove the database from its website and not repost it, citing a "concern for public safety."

-- NRA-ILA Grassroots Alert, Vol. 14, No. 43, Oct. 26, 2007

Waterboarding si, Thumbscrews no?

Senate Democrats pilloried Attorney General-nominee Michael Mukasey for his assurances to Sen. Charles Schumer (D-NY) that he would enforce a law to prohibit waterboarding [simulated drowning] if Congress were to enact such a measure.

Schumer's approval helped ensure Mukasey's nomination would sail through the Judiciary Committee. In an 11-8 vote, the committee approved Mukasey's nomination, with Schumer and Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) siding with all nine Judiciary Committee Republicans.

Majority Whip Dick Durbin (D-IL), who sits on the Judiciary Committee, said he has been "troubled ... since the first time [Schumer] mentioned it to me to think that it's our responsibility to pass a new law if we

want waterboarding to be considered torture."

He insisted a bill to outlaw waterboarding was unnecessary and would not move through the 110th Congress. "I think we're setting ourselves up for the argument, 'Man, if we had just done our job and passed a law [then] Michael Mukasey might have understood that waterboarding - which has been torture for 500 years - is still torture,'" Durbin said.

Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy (D-VT) said his panel would not take up such a bill because it would open up new questions on whether interrogators can employ other techniques that could be construed as torture, such as electrocution or pulling out a detainee's fingernails.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) said, "If we ban waterboarding, do we next have to ban thumb screws? Or next do we have to ban whatever other sordid torture you can come up with?"

-- *The Hill*, Nov. 7, 2007

Ed.: You can bet Senators Schumer and Feinstein, rabid opponents of the militia and private gun ownership – and therefore enemies of the Constitution and the rule of law – would not object to waterboarding being used against U.S. militiamen, too, should we ever be declared "enemy combatants".

Torture, the Geneva Conventions and the School of the Americas

By Col. Ann Wright, USAR (Ret.)

I spoke for the first time at the School of the Americas Watch protest at Fort Benning, Georgia, on Saturday, November 17, 2006. As a US Army veteran with 29 years of active and reserve duty who retired as a colonel, I felt tremendous emotions while addressing over 20,000 protesters. We were there as witnesses to a history of involvement in torture by graduates of the US military's School of the Americas (SOA), now known by its less-notorious name, the Western Hemispheric Institute for Security Cooperation.

While at the School of the Americas Watch protest, I visited the SOA School and spoke to the chief of the Human Rights division, a US Army major. I asked him how he now taught the Geneva Conventions to the international classes that come through the school. Did he teach the original Geneva Conventions or the new modified US version of the Conventions? The Major without hesitation said that since the students

represent governments that, at least officially, have not changed the language of the Conventions, he would teach the original Geneva Conventions.

Ironically, it is now only in the US military schools that train international students that American students will be exposed to the original Geneva Conventions that prohibit torture in all forms, including the "alternative" methods that the Bush administration and the US Congress now condone but which are still criminal in international law. Military schools with only US students will teach the Bush version of the conventions.

-- truthout.org, Nov. 29, 2006

Tomatoes and Cheap Labor

Cheap labor? Isn't that what the whole illegal immigration issue is about?

Business doesn't want to pay a decent wage. Consumers don't want expensive produce. Government says Americans don't want the jobs.

Yet if you examine the phrase "cheap labor", it's a myth, a farce, and a lie.

Take, for example, an illegal alien with a wife and five children. He takes a job for \$5.00 or 6.00/hour. At that wage, with six dependents, he pays no income tax, yet if he files a tax return he gets an "earned income credit" of up to \$3,200 free.

He qualifies for Section 8 housing and subsidized rent.

He qualifies for food stamps.

He qualifies for free (no deductible, no co-pay) health care.

His children get free breakfasts and lunches at "free" schools.

He requires bilingual teachers and books.

He qualifies for relief from high energy bills.

If he becomes aged, blind or disabled, he and his dependents qualify for SSI.

Once qualified for SSI they can qualify for Medicare.

He is provided with Spanish language signs, bulletins and printed material.

So he and his family receive the equivalent of \$20.00 to \$30.00/hour in benefits.

Meanwhile working Americans are lucky to have \$5.00 or \$6.00/hour left after paying their bills and his-including the cost of increased crime, graffiti and trash clean-up.

Cheap labor? YEAH RIGHT! Wake up people!

-- from the Internet

Homeless in Africom

The Defense Department last month created a new unified U.S. military command in Africa called Africom that would consolidate responsibility previously split among three regional commands.

However, Africom's creation has provoked so much skepticism on the continent that one of the most basic questions - where it will be located - remains unresolved. For now, it has just over 200 staff members, and is based in Stuttgart, Germany. Led by Gen. William E. "Kip" Ward, Africom is expected to be fully operational within a year. With a budget of \$50 million this fiscal year, Africom is responsible for 53 countries in Africa and the island nations surrounding it - everything except Egypt, which will remain under the U.S. Central Command.

Since 2002, about 1,800 American military personnel have been stationed in Djibouti to stifle terrorist networks in the Horn of Africa, particularly Somalia. Money is also being poured into the Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Initiative, which has focused on training armies in western and northern African nations from Algeria to Nigeria.

Libya, Nigeria and South Africa have expressed deep reservations, partly because they believe Africom could undermine their influence.

African nations supply the U.S. with more than 24 percent of its oil - more than the Persian Gulf, at 20 percent. Much of that crude comes from or through the Gulf of Guinea.

The U.S. naval presence in the Gulf of Guinea has increased more than 50 percent since last year, said Lt. Brian Badura, a spokesman for the 6th Fleet in Naples, Italy, which commands American warships in these waters.

In a first for America's global combat commands, Africom will have a civilian deputy commander responsible for overseeing civil-military affairs and coordinating with other U.S. government agencies.

"Why should they be using the military to promote development when they already have institutions within the U.S. government that are better capable and more acceptable?" asked Wafula Okumu, an analyst at South Africa's Institute for Security Studies.

-- AP, Nov. 7, 2007

The "Lyrical Terrorist"

A 23-year-old airport worker who dubbed herself the "lyrical terrorist" is the first woman to be convicted under the Terrorism Act 2000.

Samina Malik, who burst into tears on hearing the verdict, wrote poems entitled "How To Behead" and "The Living Martyrs" and stocked a "library" of documents useful to terrorists.

Judge Peter Beaumont, the Recorder of London, bailed Malik on "house arrest" ahead of the sentencing on December 6, warning her that jail remained a possibility.

When her bedroom was searched police found a ringbinder full of documents as well as a bracelet bearing the word "jihad".

In one handwritten document, she wrote: "I want to have the death of a shaheed [martyr] ... I want the opportunity to take part in the blessed sacred duty of jihad."

One of Malik's poems, entitled "The Living Martyrs", said: "Let us make Jihad/ Move to the front line/ To chop chop head of kuffar swine".

A second poem was called "How to Behead". "It's not as messy or as hard as some may think/ It's all about the flow of the wrist," it read.

But Malik, of west London, told the jury: "I am not a terrorist." She claimed to have used the nickname "lyrical terrorist" because she thought it was "cool".

-- *Guardian*, Nov. 8, 2007

Ed.: Listen up, infidels. The word kuffar or Kaffir is an Anglicized form of the Arabic word kafir, or infidel, the disparaging term applied by Moslems to non-Moslems, the heads of whom the lyrical terrorist would "chop chop" off. Islam will spare no one -- whether Christian, Jew, agnostic or atheist -- should we ever be disarmed.

Legacy of Ashes

Part II of a review by Chalmers Johnson of Tim Weiner's book, *Legacy of Ashes*,

On September 20, 1945, President Truman abolished the Office of Strategic Services, the predecessor to the Central Intelligence Agency, established two years later by the National Security Act.

Many CIA officials were OSS veterans who believed that they had a self-appointed mission of world-shaking importance and that, as a result, they were beyond the normal legal restraints.

The historical record is unequivocal. The CIA is ham-handed and brutal in conceiving and executing clandestine operations, and it is simply no good at espionage; its operatives lack the linguistic and cultural knowledge of target countries to recruit spies effectively. The CIA also appears

to be one of the most easily penetrated espionage organizations on the planet. From the beginning, it repeatedly lost its assets to double agents.

In the early 1950s, the Agency dropped millions of dollars worth of gold bars, arms, two-way radios, and agents into Poland to support what its top officials believed was a powerful Polish underground movement. In fact, Soviet agents had wiped out the movement years before, turned key people into double agents, and played the CIA for suckers. As Weiner comments, not only had five years of planning, various agents, and millions of dollars "gone down the drain," but the "unkindest cut might have been [the Agency's] discovery that the Poles had sent a chunk of the CIA's money to the Communist Party of Italy." [pp. 67-68]. Again, after the Chinese intervention in the Korean War, the CIA dropped 212 agents into Manchuria. Within a matter of days, 101 had been killed and the other 111 captured - but this information was effectively suppressed.

The incompetence would prove unending. In 1994, the Agency finally discovered that Aldrich Ames, chief of counterintelligence for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, had been spying for the USSR for seven years and had sent innumerable U.S. agents before KGB firing squads. Weiner comments, "The Ames case revealed an institutional carelessness that bordered on criminal negligence." [p. 451]

In order to compensate for a dearth of local agents, the CIA turned increasingly to signals intelligence and other technological means of spying like U-2 reconnaissance aircraft and satellites. Still, technological espionage will seldom reveal intentions. As Haviland Smith, who ran operations against the USSR in the 1960s and 1970s, lamented, "The only thing missing is - we don't have anything on Soviet intentions. And I don't know how you get that. *And that's the charter of the clandestine service* [emphasis in original], pp. 360-61].

On the clandestine side, the human costs were much higher. The CIA's almost always misguided attempts to determine how other people should govern themselves; its support for fascists (Greece under Papadopoulos), militarists (Chile under Pinochet), and murderers (Congo under Mobutu); its uncritical support of death squads (El Salvador) and religious fanatics (Muslim fundamentalists in Afghanistan) - all these combined to pepper the world with blowback movements against the U.S.

With regard to Iraq, ironically, the intelligence service of France - a

country U.S. politicians lambasted for its failure to support us - had cultivated Naji Sabri, Iraq's foreign minister. Sabri told the French, and through it the Americans, that Saddam Hussein did not have an active nuclear or biological weapons program, but the CIA ignored him. Weiner comments ruefully, "The CIA had almost no ability to analyze accurately what little intelligence it had." [pp. 666-67, n. 487].

Perhaps the most comical of all CIA clandestine activities was the spying it did in 1994 on the U.S. ambassador to Guatemala, Marilyn McAfee, who sought to promote policies of human rights and justice in that country. Loyal to the murderous Guatemalan intelligence service, the CIA bugged her bedroom and picked up "cooing endearments to Murphy". The agency spread the word in Washington that the liberal ambassador was a lesbian having an affair with her secretary, Carol Murphy, without realizing that "Murphy" was also the name of the ambassador's poodle. The bug in her bedroom had recorded her petting her dog. She was actually a married woman from a conservative family. [p. 459]

Back in August 1945, General William Donovan, the head of the OSS, told President Truman, "Prior to the present war, the United States had no foreign intelligence service. It never has had and does not now have a coordinated intelligence system." Weiner adds, "Tragically, it still does not have one."

Ricochet

The National Rifle Association is probably the most powerful lobbying group in America, noted for its nonsense tactics and fervent membership. Beyond that, virtually everything about the NRA's political agenda, its financial structure, and how it spends the vast amounts of money it collects from contributors has been kept a tightly guarded secret, not only from the public but from NRA members as well - until now.

In *Ricochet: Confessions of a Gun Lobbyist*, Richard Feldman unmasks the inner workings, influence, and goals of this highly secretive political behemoth. From internecine warfare, media manipulation, and executive bankrolling to gun control bills and school massacres, Feldman exposes the NRA as a cynical, mercenary political cult obsessed with wielding power while exploiting members' fear in order to maximize contributions.

Looking back over his long association with the NRA, Feldman reveals the inside stories behind the organization's responses to the Bernie Goetz subway shootings, the Assault Weapons Ban, gun-control legislation, the Oklahoma City Bombing, the Long Island Railroad shootings, and Feldman's own voluntary gun-lock agreement. He explains how the NRA's inflexible positions have placed the nation's most prominent representative of law-abiding gun owners in increasing opposition to law enforcement, gun makers, and moderate Republicans. The upshot is that the NRA is not an effective advocate for its members' interests. Obsessed with fundraising, scare-mongering, and wielding political power, NRA leadership undermines commonsense solutions that would protect gun owners' rights while reducing accidental shootings and gun violence.

Ricochet is not for gun control advocates: It is a wake-up call for gun owners who cherish their Second Amendment rights. The message is that the NRA has betrayed your trust, misused your hard-earned donations, and strengthened the hand of those who would take your guns away. Read this hard-hitting exposé to discover how this has happened and what you can do about it.

-- Richard Feldman was a regional political director for the NRA in the 1980s. In the 1990s he was chief lobbyist and spokesman for the firearm industry's national trade association. He is the founder of MLS Communications, a public relations and political consulting business

(www.mlscommunication.com).
* * * *

Richard Feldman spent much of the 1980s and 1990s lobbying for gun owners and manufacturers, working first as a regional political director for the NRA, then as executive director of the American Shooting Sports Council. But he had a bitter falling out with the NRA when the ASSC -- which represented manufacturers and retailers -- struck a deal with the Clinton administration to voluntarily add child-safety locks to their products. Now he's promoting a juicy tell-all book -- "Ricochet: Confessions of a Gun Lobbyist" -- replete with details on how the gun lobby works. He stopped by the *Times* today to chat about his thoughts on the right way to combat gun violence (hint: it's not more stringent gun control laws).

--From the Los Angeles Times Primary Source. "Ruminations of a (former) gun lobbyist", Oct. 31, 2007

More on the U.N.'s gun ban

By an 81-10 vote, the Senate has passed Sen. David Vitter's amendment to prevent any funding to foreign organizations that infringe upon the Second Amendment rights of lawful American citizens. Any organization that adopts a policy anathema to the U.S. Constitution's Second Amendment would no longer be eligible for U.S. financial assistance—including the U.N.

The gun ban issue in the U.N. has been percolating for more than a decade, and while NRA has been successful to date in precluding the U.N. from enacting its anti-freedom agenda, the bureaucrats at Turtle Bay remain committed to additional restrictions on the rights of free gun owners in the United States and around the globe.

Global registration and tracking of firearms would inevitably lead to the global disarmament of free citizens everywhere. NRA will remain vigilant in monitoring the U.N.'s anti-gun actions and speaking out in the international community in support of Americans' Second Amendment rights.

-- NRA-ILA, Sept. 7, 2007

The Ron Paul Phenomenon

Rep. Ron Paul, the libertarian Republican presidential candidate from Texas, told the Associated Press that his campaign raised \$4.2 million in about 24 hours from more than 37,000 contributors, breaking the record for online fundraising in a single day during the pre-convention primary process.

Paul is an outspoken opponent of abortion and the war in Iraq, and wants to abolish the Internal Revenue Service. He's become something of an Internet phenomenon and raised \$5 million overall in the third quarter this year. The campaign aims to raise \$12 million in the quarter ending Dec. 31.

Paul spokesman Jesse Benton says contributors to the campaign are diverse. Among those he says are part of the "Ron Paul coalition": * The "Old Right," people he describes as Robert Taft and Barry Goldwater Republicans.

* Gun-rights supporters (he calls Paul

"probably the strongest supporter of Second Amendment rights in the Congress").

* Progressives who want to end the Iraq war and are "sick of what they're getting from the Democrats."

* Social conservatives who oppose abortion.

-- USA Today On Politics, Nov. 5, 2007

* * *

Call 1-888-322-1414 for Rep. Ron Paul's weekly legislative report. Hear the truth from one of America's most well-informed, courageous and patriotic defenders of liberty; www.house.gov/paul and www.ronpaul2008.com

Media Lies & Confusion

The *Miami Herald* has taken up the "assault weapon" issue, making false claims about guns defined as such under the expired Clinton Gun Ban.

1) The *Herald* claimed that a Glock 19 is an "assault weapon," presumably because it is designed to use a detachable ammunition magazine. 2) It claimed that a person can fire 600 rounds in 60 seconds with a semi-automatic AK-47. 3) It bemoaned the "assault weapons ban that President Bush let sunset in 2004," and claimed that, frustration with the sunsetting of the "assault weapon" ban caused California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey and New York to enact their own bans.

First, a Glock 19 has never been defined as an "assault weapon". Second, no one can pull the trigger 600 times a minute (one for each round in an twenty 30-round AK-47 magazines) while changing magazines every three seconds. Third, the president cannot sign a bill unless it has been passed by Congress; the Clinton Gun Ban sunsetted because Congress did not renew it. Furthermore, the state bans were enacted between 1989 and 2001, at least three years before the expiration of the Clinton Gun Ban.

Letters to the Editor

Thank you for "Let's Roll" [on NJ militia's website]. It should have

been in the newsletter. I rarely visit the site, Outlook Express SUCKS! Half the time "some error has occurred." I will thank Professor Barnett for writing "Let's Roll". I am also grateful for Art. 1, Sect. 1 which I learned about many years ago. I will try to get a friend to help you with the site. I will get Art. 1, Sec. 1 on the back of my next batch of business cards. I will approach the bikers in ABATE. They understand about freedom and the need for political action.

RR, Sussex County

* * *

Dear NJM,

I was wondering if I could pay for a subscription to your newsletter in stamps and if so how much? I've enjoyed your newsletter now for a while but I've been moved from the institution I was at where my friend gave me your newsletter. Keep up the good work.

SS, Federal prisoner, California

* * *

NJ Militia,

Send newsletter. Heard that militias are grouped by counties chapter. Has NJ militia gotten in touch with Montana militia. There is a possibility they could teach us something.

Good luck

TT, Monmouth County

Concealed Carry Trojan Horse

We already know that we all have a G-D given right to defend our lives. We should NEVER trade it for a revocable state-granted "privilege" [to carry a concealed weapon] for which you must:

*Pay

*Get registered

*Get photographed

*Get fingerprinted

*And are restricted in its use

History has shown repeatedly that government regulation schemes and private gun ownership are not compatible. Do you really want government agents knowing you are a gun owner?

-- Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership ALERT: CCW Trojan Horse, June 23, 2006, www.jpfo.org

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____